

BEST COPY
AVAILABLE

... was on the floor. He is present.
The clerk unanimously consents that
the speaker for the quorum call be
...
PRESIDING OFFICER Without
... it is so ordered.

REPORT OF FINANCIAL HOLDINGS OF SENATOR YOUNG OF OHIO

MR. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President,
I ask unanimous consent to have printed
this point in the Record a statement
I made in writing to the Secretary of the
Senate.

There being no objection, the state-
ment was ordered to be printed in the
Record, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR YOUNG OF OHIO

BY FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary of the Senate,
U. S. Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: At the outset of con-
sidering the 88th Congress, I file with you
and publicly report my financial holdings.
I have done this before. In my campaign
for election in 1958, I made two promises to
citizens in asking for their votes: (1) that
I would make public my financial interests
and personal finances so that anyone could
judge whether or not any of my votes were
cast for purely selfish reasons and against
the public interest; and (2) that I would
conduct myself at all times and always vote
in accord with my judgment and conscience,
giving no thought to political considera-
tions, that no pressure groups would prevail
and that this was the last public office I
would occupy and I intended to try hard to
be a good public servant.

I owned stock in sugar corporations, such
as Cuban-American Sugar Co., Fajardo, Cen-
tral Violeto & South Puerto Rico Sugar Co.,
and I have sold all stocks I owned in such
corporations. In addition, I sold my stock in
Pan American Airways, which corporation
owns Cape Canaveral. I did this because of
my membership on the Senate Committees
on Aeronautical and Space Sciences and on
Agriculture.

I make public a complete and correct
statement of my financial holdings. I own
real estate in Ohio, Mississippi, and Washing-
ton, D.C. Also, I have conveyed an oil
lease on my Mississippi acreage, which may
possibly result in income. In addition to
the real estate and stocks, I also own a
modest amount of some U.S. Government
bonds.

As a member of the Committee on Ways
and Means of the House of Representatives,
I voted to reduce the depletion allowance
on oil and gas producing corporations from
27 to 15 percent. I have not changed my
views. As Senator, I voted for an amend-
ment to reduce this depletion allowance.

Some of the oil stock I own was pur-
chased by me before I went overseas in World
War II. Like other stockholders, I receive
earnings letters and circulars along with divi-
dends, urging me to write my Congressman,
expressing views coinciding with those of
the corporate officials. This is an additional
reason causing me to feel I should make a
financial disclosure. Obviously, circulars of
this sort are not persuasive to me. With
my views a matter of record, I knew of no
reason for selling my stock in oil producing
corporations.

I owe no banking institution or individual
any unsecured loan. I owe to banking in-
stitutions two real estate mortgages and
notes and this, and other secured loans I
owe, total approximately \$116,000.

I own the following shares of stock: 2,082
W. R. Grace & Co., 1,100 Airport Parking of
America, 921 Monsanto Chemical, 809 Mission
Development, 800 Sinclair Oil, 295 Robbins &
Sons, 100 Canadian Pacific Railway, 200

General Fireproofing 160 Atlantic Refining,
230 Pacific Northern Airlines, 106 United
Fruit, 100 Delta Airlines, 104 Socony Mobil,
131 Ashland Oil & Refining, 40 British
Petroleum, 50 Rainbow Products, 49 Scurry
Rainbow, 6 Getty Oil, 100 Luck Stores, Inc.,
200 DuBois Chemicals, 150 Radio Corp of
America, and 31 Tidewater Oil.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN M. YOUNG

PROTECTION OF CITIZENS OF MAINE BY SENATOR SMITH

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, in the
years when we had a Republican Presi-
dent, I did not permit his being a Re-
publican to prevent me from taking issue
with him when I felt that he had not
acted in the best interests of the people
of Maine. One of the matters on which
I disagreed with him was his action for
the protection of the oil industry—when
he placed restrictions on oil imports for
the protection of oil interests here at
home—but discrimination for oil in-
terests in Texas and elsewhere at the
expense of the people of Maine, who re-
peatedly are victims of high oil prices
about which they can do nothing be-
cause they are a captive market.

With vigor, I criticized the Republican
President. And in view of the recent
action of the Democratic President re-
stricting imports of oil, I am equally
critical of this action which discrimi-
nates against the people of Maine, and
I am critical with equally bipartisan
vigor.

I speak of this today because our Na-
tion is going through its coldest spell
of this season and because prospects are
that we will continue to have our coldest
weather for the next 2 months.

I speak of it because I remember so
well what happened in past years during
such cold periods, of how fuel oil prices
went up, of how the restrictions against
oil imports lessened competition so much
that the fuel oil prices could be easily
raised in the coldest time of the year,
when Maine people in a captive market
could do nothing about it, could not con-
vert to another means of heat, had no
choice but to pay the raised fuel oil
prices or go cold and risk their health
and their lives.

It is said that what is past is prolog
and that future actions can be predicted
on the basis of past behavior. If this
pattern should prove to be the case, then
the people of Maine—and of the other
captive market areas of our Nation—
face the tragic possibility that again they
will be at the mercy of the oil producers
with hiked prices when they can do nothing
but pay the hiked prices.

In this connection, I want to make it
crystal clear that I refer to the oil pro-
ducers—and not to the oil distributors—
for the distributors are at the mercy of
the oil producers. I know this because
many of the oil distributors in Maine
have expressed to me their own recent-
ment of the price hikes that are forced
upon them by the oil producers.

One of the reasons why I was so hesi-
tant to vote for the trade expansion bill
was the manner in which that legislation
sacrificed the textile, shoe, and plywood

protected the oil industry of Texas and
other States from foreign oil imports.
It is true that the name of oil was not
mentioned in the protective provisions
of that legislation. But if you dug a little
deeper than the surface words of that
legislation, you found that very clearly
oil was one of the commodities given pro-
tective exemption from the provisions of
the legislation.

What is this power that the oil inter-
ests have which enables them to receive
such protection to the detriment of fuel
oil users? Why the protection against
the foreign oil competition imports that
could competitively bring the prices
down—protection given by a Republican
President and now by a Democratic Presi-
dent? Why protection for the million-
aires in the oil industry, but no protection
for the little textile worker and the little
shoe worker?

In the face of a huge deficit, Congress
has been asked to make a tax cut. But
the emphasis appears to be on a tax cut
rather than on tax reform. Why do we
not close up some of the flagrant tax
loopholes such as the 27½-percent deple-
tion allowance that the oil millionaires
enjoy? Why is tax protection and fav-
oritism continually given to them, just as
in the recent action of the President re-
stricting oil imports for their protection
and helping them keep their prices up?

Why all the evident concern and action
for the oil millionaires? Why is not some
action taken for the protection of the
little man? Why not some protective
action for the little people who hover
around a fuel oil stove in the cold of
winter after spending the precious small
amount of money they have for fuel oil
to keep warm and to survive the winter?

FREEDOM ACADEMY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am
very happy to join with Senator MURK
and nearly a dozen other Senators in
cosponsoring legislation to create a Free-
dom Commission and Freedom Academy.
I enthusiastically support this proposal
to create institutions to mobilize the
United States for the continuing battle
against international communism in all
its forms.

From the time this proposal was origi-
nally put forward in the 86th Congress,
it has had impressive, diverse, and bi-
partisan support. The senatorial co-
sponsors are a bipartisan group. The
bill has the support of the AFL-CIO. It
has always enjoyed tremendous public
support among eminent professors and
Soviet specialists, and it is backed vigor-
ously by millions of Americans who see
the increasing need every year for more
effective techniques to combat the So-
viet menace.

Mr. President, this year for the first
time the State Department and the
administration has recognized the defici-
ency in governmental training pro-
grams for personnel who must deal with
the Communists and formulate our pol-
icies toward them. For the first time
the State Department is itself moving to-
ward a similar objective. The Presi-
dent's advisory panel, headed by James
of the Carnegie Corporation

of New York, has called for a National Academy of Foreign Affairs.

Mr. President, there is much in the Perkins report that I would applaud. It is anticipated that specific recommendations in the form of legislation will be sent to the Congress as soon as they are completed. The purpose of reintroducing this bill in a slightly revised form at this point is not to preclude consideration of other suggestions that may come before the Congress. Rather it is to permit a full study and hearing to be held on all relevant possibilities. For instance, specific questions have been raised as to whether this institution should be limited to college graduates if persons are otherwise qualified, as to whether training in such an institution should be limited to government personnel, as to whether citizens of foreign nations should be permitted to attend, and as to whether such an institution should replace or merely supplement the present Foreign Service Institute. These and other questions will have to be studied in some detail during the legislative process.

But the time has undoubtedly come, Mr. President, to acknowledge the need for an institution to prepare Americans to wage the kind of nonmilitary warfare at which the Communists excel. The Communists have long been experts in using political, psychological, economic, and technological weapons in their ambitious plan for world conquest. In the military field there is no doubt that our resources are as great as theirs—in fact, greater. But in these other nonmilitary areas they have a network of organizations and tactics that have been active for years. We, on the other hand, must mobilize ourselves more effectively to meet the many-pronged challenge of Soviet political warfare. The purpose of this institution would be to help American citizens, primarily in government, to develop the professional competence, experience, and knowledge necessary to meet the extraordinary variety of techniques employed by the Communists throughout the world. Prompt congressional action along the lines of this bill or similar proposals would constitute a long and important step in strengthening America's arsenal of nonmilitary cold-war weapons.

ANTI-SEMITISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the U.S.S.R., as its propaganda boasts will affirm, is a party to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Article 18 of that declaration states:

Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship, and observance.

Soviet actions belie this pledge. We have ample documentation of the Soviet treatment of one of its minorities, the Jews. This sordid evidence is detailed in an article by Moshe Decter in the January 1963 issue of Foreign Affairs Quar-

terly, published by the Council on Foreign Relations. It contains a dossier of Soviet perfidy that should be included in the files of all who would pin the lie on Communist pretenses of regard for individual and group rights. It reveals the extent of just one aspect of Soviet racism at a time when the Russians are making their strongest appeals to the newly emergent nations of Asia and Africa.

The following are some of the salient features of current Soviet anti-Semitism:

1. While there are over 100 nationalities in the U.S.S.R. which are granted the right to their own cultural institutions, their own schools, and their own language, the Jewish people—who are considered as members of the Jewish nationality by Russian law—are the only such group denied any semblance of nationality rights.

2. Jews who maintain their Jewish identity—and item 5 of all Soviet passports lists an individual's nationality—face increasing restrictions in educational and occupational opportunity.

3. While all the major religious groups in the Soviet are permitted regional or national ecclesiastic organizations so they might maintain contact with their people, only the Jewish religious groups are barred from official contact with one another.

4. Bibles, prayerbooks, and religious objects have been provided all other religious groups in the Soviet; these have, in effect, been denied Jews. In addition, while other faiths are truly permitted houses of worship, Jewish synagogues have been closed in community after community.

5. Synagogue leaders have been arrested on undisclosed charges. Jews are also being singled out in the Soviet press for so-called economic crimes and capital sentences are meted out to them in increasing numbers. As Mr. Decter points out in his article, a "policy of cultural and religious repression is conducted within the charged atmosphere of a virulent press campaign against Judaism."

These facts add up to a damning indictment of Soviet deeds as contrasted with Soviet words. While other nations, our own included, are called upon to answer charges of racism within national borders, the U.S.S.R., by the peculiar standard of international double morality which has too long been to its advantage, seems exempt from this obligation. It is incumbent upon the Soviets to disprove these charges or to stand before the world wearing the brand of racism which it has so eloquently decried in its own propaganda pronouncements. The Kremlin in the treatment of its Jewish minority clearly has one standard of morality for its own conduct and another higher standard for use in picturing itself to the world.

SOLICITATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES FOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, there recently has been much talk, in the press and out, pertaining to the solicitation of Federal employees for contributions to political dinners. It was not the intent of the so-called Hatch Act to prohibit a classified civil service employee from voting as he pleases or even attending a dinner which might properly be labeled a birthday or party dinner.

It was and is the intent of the law to prohibit a public employee or anyone else from soliciting another public employee on public property for funds to such an occasion. Any such solicitation by a Federal employee, or by anyone else on public property, or elsewhere, which carries with it the slightest intimation that it might be best for the civil service employee to make a contribution, or to purchase tickets, is in my opinion a violation of the law.

If this procedure were permitted to continue, it could very well ruin the entire merit system.

One of the great privileges which has been mine has been that of working with the devoted Federal employees during my tenure in the Congress. To be able to watch the development of our excellent Federal merit system, and to have had a small part in its growth, is a source of satisfaction to me. I for one do not intend to remain silent when political leaders or others may in a mood of over-enthusiasm pursue a course which might jeopardize the true working of our merit system.

Many excellent articles and editorials have been written recently in regard to the assessment by the Democrat National Committee of our Federal employees for the President's inaugural anniversary dinner.

Joe Young of the Washington Star has written an excellent article stressing the lack of concern on the part of employee organizations in behalf of their own members.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EMPLOYEE GROUPS' SILENCE VIEWED AS STRANGE IN \$100 TICKET PRESSURE

(By Joseph Young)

Perhaps the strangest aspect of the entire spectacle of unashamed Democratic pressure on Government career employees to attend tonight's \$100-a-ticket gala is the complete silence of Government employee unions and the National Civil Service League on the matter.

Not a peep has been heard from any of the major unions or the nonpartisan league, which came into being 80 years ago to uphold the merit system, since this reporter and the Star on December 6 first disclosed the pressure on career employees to purchase the \$100 tickets.

The employee leaders appear too intent on such unattainable pie-in-the-sky objectives as a 35-hour work week, etc., to bother with the unprecedented pressure on career employees by the Democratic National Committee and officials of the Kennedy administration. Only the recently formed National Society of Federal Engineers, Scientists, and Allied Professionals have criticized the goings-on.

The unions' excuse is that not many career employees in the upper middle and top grades are members of their organizations, and hence they don't want to get into the fray. The long-range adverse implications on the merit system seem to escape them.

The silence of the National Civil Service League is even more puzzling. The main purpose of the nonpartisan business-supported league is ostensibly to protect and support the merit system.

The failure of Government employ unions to protest the situation may r